THE MISSISSIPPI QUARTERLY

A Journal Devoted to Scholarly Studies

Fall 1956

MISSISSIPPI STATE COLLEGE

The Social Science Research Center

STATE COLLEGE, MISSISSIPPI

The *MISSISSIPPI* *QUARTERLY*

September, 1956 Volume IX Number 4

CONTENTS

JOHN J. SCANLON

Education's Greatest Challenge 164

R. A. McLEMORE

The Administration of Higher Education in Mississippi .72

A. A. MYERS

Soil and Water Conservation in Mississippi 177

R. C. WEEMS, JR.

The Ippy Family and Their Eight Children 181

JOSEPH O. BAYLEN

Two Letters from Pobedonostsev, 1902-1903 186

Published by The Social Science Research Center, State College, Miss.

John K. Bettersworth Editor

Acceptance under Section 24.64 PL&R authorized

Annual subscription (effective January, 1957) $2.00

EDITORIAL NOTES

This issue of the *Mississippi Quarterly* features a portion of the papers read at the annual meeting of the Mississippi Research Clearing House, held on the campus of Millsaps College, April 17, 1956.

The morning seminar on "Water Resources in Mississippi" included the paper by A. A. Myers, of the U. S. Soil Conservation Service.

The luncheon speaker was Mr. John J. Scanlon, Deputy Director of Research for the Fund of Advancement of Education. Mr. Scanlon's address is included as the leading article of this issue of the *Quarterly*.

The afternoon meeting dealt with the findings of the Brewton Report on Mississippi's Institutions of Higher Learning. From this session we are publishing a discussion of administrative problems by Dr. R. A. McLemore, Dean of Mississippi Southern College, and a sprightly parable by Dean R. C. Weems, Jr., then of Mississippi State College, now of the University of Nevada.

* * *

Our documentary feature for this issue (the Pobedonostsev letters) was prepared by Professor Joseph O. Baylen, Chairman of the Division of Social Science, Delta State College.

THE MISSISSIPPI QUARTERLY

SPECIAL NOTICE

The current issue of the *Mississippi Quarterly* comes after a hiatus of one quarter, and will complete Volume IX as well as the year 1956. Beginning with the next issue, to appear in January (Volume X, No. 1) the *Quarterly* will be forced to charge a subscription rate of two dollars annually. This charge will in part pay the costs of publication, which have mounted constantly since this journal first appeared and began to be distributed gratis as a service of the Social Science Research Center of Mississippi State College. The *Quarterly* will still be subsidized by the college to a great degree, but the charging of a subscription fee will enable us to undertake a degree of expansion and improvement not otherwise possible.

The expanded *Quarterly* will continue under the editorship-in-chief of the present editor. However, an editorial board representing the major fields contributing to the *Quarterly* will be established. The board will consist of R. B. Holland, H. A. Pedersen, G. K. Bryan, and Chester Wells, with Harold S. Snellgrove serving as secretary of the editorial board and managing editor of the *Quarterly*. At the same time, Scott Osborn will assume the position of business manager. Robert Holland will serve as book review editor. All editorial correspondence should henceforth be directed to Harold S. Snellgrove, Box 357, State College. Subscriptions and correspondence of a business nature should be directed to Scott C. Osborn, Box 69, State College.

In order not to miss the first issue under the "New Model" please send us your check promptly. Mail your check to Dr. Scott Osborn, Box 69, State College, Mississippi.

EDUCATION'S GREATEST CHALLENGE

By JOHN J. SCANLON

No question is more earnestly discussed these days among people interested in the future of American education than the prospect and consequences of what has been called "the tidal wave" of students which will flood our schools and colleges in the next ten to twenty years.

Steeply rising enrollments present a number of serious problems to schools and colleges. More buildings will be needed. Substantially larger appropriations of money will be required. Overshadowing these, however, is the problem of securing enough really able teachers. More than anything else — far more than anything else — the quality of teachers and of teaching will determine the quality of education in the years ahead. It is with teachers therefore, that these remarks are concerned.

On the morning of May 27, 1955, the population indicator in the main lobby of the Department of Commerce building in Washington, D. C., registered 165,000,000 — a figure which only ten years ago the Census Bureau believed would not be reached before the year 2000, if ever.

Operating like the mileage indicator on an automobile speedometer, the population "clock" registers one birth every eight seconds, one death every 21 seconds, the arrival of one immigrant every two minutes, and the departure of one emigrant every 24 minutes -- one net addition to the U. S. population every 12 seconds. In a very real sense, the steady ticking of this clock day in and day out dramatizes the magnitude of the task which confronts public and private education in the United States in the years ahead.

Growth is nothing new in American education. For generations we have been providing more young people with more years of schooling than any other nation in the world.

What is new in the present situation is the combination of a sharply accelerated rate of growth in enrollments and a severe shortage of well-qualified teachers which, together, threaten to cause a progressive deterioration of quality at all levels of education over the next two decades.

The population of the United States has grown steadily, but the rate of growth had slowed considerably prior to World War II. During the depression decade of the Thirties immigration virtually ceased and the birth rate fell to record low levels. As a result, the 1930-40 net increase in

U. S. population was smaller than in any decade since 1860-1870 and percentage-wise was the smallest on record. This led many experts to predict that the population soon would level off and perhaps gradually decline.

The decade 1940-1950, however, brought a dramatic reversal of the previous trend. For the first time in the history of our Nation, the rate of population growth turned up sharply. Population grew twice as fast as in the previous decade due in considerable measure to an abrupt rise in births.

This high level of births has persisted. In 1946, more babies were born than in any other year in our history — and that record has been surpassed every year since. The four million mark was broken in 1954, and again in 1955.

No one can confidently predict the future level of births. Population experts point to factors that may cause a temporary slackening within the next 10 years. But a new upswing in the 1960's seems inevitable when the bumper crop of the Forties starts having babies. There is every indication that our schools and colleges are moving to a permanently higher level of enrollments.

This much is certain: The children already born will tax our educational system severely for 20 years to come.

The rise in births has already produced an acute overcrowding of our elementary schools. In 1950 elementary school enrollments rose to 22 million after remaining fairly constant at about 20 million throughout the Forties. Each year since 1950 has brought a further increase. When school opened in September, the U. S. Office of Education estimated 1955-1956 elementary enrollments at 29 million.

But further increases are yet to come. Most of the children born in the last five record-breaking years have not yet started to school. The more than four million babies born last year will not reach kindergarten age until 1960, when the first group of postwar children will be moving on to the ninth grade. By 1960, elementary enrollments will be 68 percent above 1946 and 28 percent above 1954.

Secondary school enrollments, which have been rising gradually for 10 years, will increase considerably in each of the next five years, and by 1960 will begin to reflect the full impact of high postwar births. By 1969, the children already born will push secondary school enrollments to more than 70 percent above the 1954 level.

The severest impact of high postwar births will be upon higher education where most room exists for expansion in the proportion of young people actually enrolled.

The unparalleled economic prosperity of postwar America, the rise in family incomes, the increasing demand for college-trained people in business, government and the professions, and the increasing tendency for a college education to be equated with higher earning power, strongly indicate that the percentage of college-age youth seeking a college education is likely to continue upward during the next 20 years.

It is impossible to predict with assurance what proportion of young people will be attending college 10 or 20 years from now. Therefore let's

take a look at two plausible possibilities. The first is based upon a recent projection by the U. S. Office of Education, which assumes little rise in the proportion of young people attending college. The second indicates what will happen if the average trend of the past 15 years continues into the future — that is, if the ratio of college enrollments to the size of the 18-21 age group keeps growing at one percentage point each year (from about 30 percent in 1955 to 48 percent by 1973). Under the first assumption, college enrollments would reach 5,000,000 by 1973; under the second, the figure would be more than 7,000,000.

Pinpoint precision is not important here; the significant point is that growth of anything like the magnitude suggested by these two projections will confront higher education with acute problems. Whether one takes the high assumption or the low, or something in between, it is evident that college enrollments are likely to reach double their 1954 level sometime between 1966 and 1971.

This prospect poses many basic policy issues for the colleges and universities. For example, should an effort be made to dampen the expansion by applying more rigorous standards of admission? Should curriculum offerings be overhauled and drastically pruned? Should tuitions be raised to cover a larger share of the actual costs of education? Should quality standards be lowered if necessary in order to recruit more faculty members, or should standards be kept up and the faculty-student rates reduced? How should the expansion be shared as between privately-supported and tax-supported colleges? What would be the eventual results of a non-expansion policy by private colleges which ultimately reduced their proportion of total national enrollments from the recent 50 percent to 25 percent or less?

This prospective rise in enrollments confronts American schools and colleges with a staggering problem of finding enough good teachers. How many will be needed if we assume that the teaching force is expanded in direct proportion to the number of students?

The schools will have to enlarge their total teaching staff more in the next 10 years than in the previous 35. The colleges and universities will have to add more teachers in the next 15 years than in all previous history combined.

There will need to be about 1.7 million school teachers on the job in 1965 compared to about 1.2 million today. This estimate assumes one teacher for every 30 elementary pupils and one for every 25 secondary students, which approximates the over-all national ratio since 1930.

The problem is not merely one of recruiting over 46,000 new school teachers annually for expansion. About three times this many must be found annually to replace the teachers who leave — to get married, raise children, take non-teaching jobs, retire, or for other reasons. This approximates 8 to 10 percent a year, excluding teachers who transfer from one school to another. The 10 percent replacement rate used here makes modest allowance for gradually reducing present overcrowding and the number of untrained emergency teachers.

In order to provide for replacements, expansion and the maintenance of present pupil-teacher ratios, the schools of the Nation must find 16 new teachers between now and 1965 for every 10 teachers now on the job. This is the equivalent of replacing all the teachers we now have and finding 60 percent in addition — all within 10 years.

At the college level the problem is even more challenging. The replacement rate is estimated at only 4 percent, considerably lower than in the schools, but the growth of enrollments is expected to be relatively greater. If the present student-teacher ratio of 13 to 1 is to be preserved, for every 10 college teachers now employed, somewhere between 16 and 25 new ones will have to be found between now and 1970.

If we match our needs against the prospective supply of well-qualified teachers, we can come to only one conclusion. It will be impossible under the present pattern of teacher recruitment and teacher utilization to secure anywhere near enough good teachers for our schools and colleges over the next 15 years.

The basic reason is far simpler to state than to remedy. Teaching demands the best educated and best quality of our young people. But so do business, government and other important fields, and in ever increasing numbers. The supply of such manpower is scarce and will undoubtedly fall short of demand so long as our economy continues to grow and prosper. In the vigorous bidding for an adequate share of this short supply, education finds itself at an increasing competitive disadvantage.

Our main source of qualified new teachers today is the annual output of college graduates.

About one-fifth of all 1954 graduates of four-year colleges entered school teaching. But over the next ten years one-half of such college graduates of every variety would have to enter school teaching in order to fill our needs entirely from this major source.

At the college level, the problem will be even more acute. Colleges look largely to the graduate schools for their new faculty members and have come to regard the Ph. D. degree as a bench-mark of quality — though it is well recognized that many excellent teachers do not possess this degree and some who do hold it are ineffective teachers. But during the next 15 years, the need for new college teachers will far outstrip our annual output of Ph. D. 's.

The graduate schools will with difficulty increase their output of Ph. D. 's, but the output up to 1970 will fall far short of meeting the need for college teachers. Moreover, teaching is likely to get a diminishing share of new Ph. D. 's as business and government bid with high salaries for numbers of people with advanced training. Even during the 1930's higher education got no better than 60 percent of the new Ph. D. 's (only 34% in chemistry, the largest field) and this proportion has undoubtedly declined since then.

From a recent study of 637 colleges it may be judged that something on the order of 40% of present college teachers have a Ph. D. If the output of new Ph. D. 's conforms roughly to the pattern projected in the Fund's recent study, the proportion of all college teachers with a Ph. D. may decline to roughly 20 percent by 1970.

These figures are necessarily rough approximations, but the accuracy of the general picture they paint is not in doubt. Our colleges will find it impossible in the course of the next 15 years to hire new teachers of the same average quality and educational preparation as their present faculty in great enough numbers to maintain present student-teacher ratios. This means that the typical college student in 1965 or 1970 will almost certainly encounter fewer really able teachers than he would today.

Tremendous change will surely be forced upon American education during the next twenty years by the pressure of numbers and the shortage of teachers. Whether the change will be for better or for worse is still an open question, to be answered by the American people.

If we preserve the present arrangements which govern the recruitment, training, and utilization of teachers, we can almost certainly expect a progressive erosion of quality. Alternatively, with a liberal application of imagination, boldness, and effort we may guide the course of change toward better rather than poorer quality.

No detailed blueprints for this latter course are presently available. Several promising steps have been suggested but are not yet fully tested, while others no doubt remain to be invented.

A few basic guides are self-evident, however. First, if we mean to improve quality, then every specific action taken must be directed toward this objective. Temporary expedients that compromise quality are likely to mean long-range deterioration. Second, if we are to improve the supply we must also improve the utilization of teachers, for the two are inseparable. How we utilize teachers will affect the educational results achieved, the salaries we can afford to pay them, the esteem in which we hold them, and the calibre of those we get. Finally, the changes that must be wrought, whatever shape they take, will obviously not be painless. They will cost money, and they will challenge our natural reluctance to expose old procedures and beliefs to the test of new and possibly better ways.

Our use of skilled manpower in education has changed relatively little in half a century. It stands in paradoxical contrast to other fields in which a professional revolution over the years has produced a steadily more efficient use of skilled manpower.

Each profession or occupation is unique in important respects. Teaching is distinctly different from engineering, medicine, architecture, the ministry, and various business positions. Yet few would contend that these differences exempt teaching from the basic principles which have improved manpower utilization in other professions and throughout the American economy.

Elsewhere than teaching, skilled professionals have served more people and served them better as they have progressively delegated their sub-professional tasks to less highly trained technicians and other assistants. The architect or engineer saves his valuable time and serves more clients by hiring draftsmen to prepare detailed drawings; the judge handles more cases because he has a law clerk; the doctor serves more patients because he has transferred many former tasks to technical assistants; the nurse's aide has enabled the professional nurse to serve more patients.

Productivity in these various professions has been further enhanced by the use of improved technology and more equipment.

The same basic trend has occurred, often dramatically, in other sectors of our society. The farmer, with less effort, harvests more acres and more per acre than his father did; the automobile worker is far more productive than his predecessor of 1925. The increased wages and salaries of all these people, professional and non-professional, reflect their greater productivity resulting from their better utilization. Education is entitled to much credit for this progress in the American economy, yet education has not adopted the techniques of progress in equal measure nor partaken equitably of the fruits.

In professions other than teaching it is also usual for gradations of ability to be recognized. By and large the most skillful members of a profession serve more people than the less skilled and are rewarded by society accordingly. But in a school or college the best teacher usually serves no more students than the mediocre teachers.

Mounting apprehension over the prospects of American education has led a growing number of educators and laymen to the view that the whole problem of size and quality and salaries is intimately related to the manner in which we employ our teachers' talents.

This line of reasoning has recently led a number of school systems, colleges and universities to embark upon experiments in the better utilization of teachers, not to work them harder but to afford them a better opportunity to be more effective and more professional. Underlying these experiments is the conviction that if the major forms of manpower waste in education could be sharply reduced — if all teachers were free to concentrate full-time on teaching and professional growth, if the best of our teachers could extend their unique effectiveness to more students, and if the power of students to learn much for themselves could be fully released — if all these things could be done, then educational quality and enrollments could almost certainly rise together.

A variety of approaches to greater efficiency in education are being considered, tested, and applied. One is to clarify the aims and priorities of schools and colleges, and in light of such clarifications to strip the curriculum of less essential items which have accumulated over the years.

Another approach is to utilize older and more advanced students to participate in the instruction of younger ones, thereby sharpening their own perceptions and relieving regular teachers of sub-professional tasks. Closely related are efforts to reverse the trend toward what has been called "spoon feeding," by confronting students with a greater challenge and opportunity to pursue learning on their own. It has been noted by some college officials, for example, that what we call "independent study" for abler students is in fact the most dependent form of study in which the least number of students are served by an individual faculty member.

The whole question of class size, which touches perhaps the most sensitive of educational convictions is presently undergoing systematic reexamination in experiments involving the use of teacher aides, and the use of classroom television, and other devices for making better use of the teacher's professional talents.

Other imaginative experiments are being undertaken in various schools and colleges where thoughtful educators and laymen are exploring such questions as these:

> Can we find ways to use the teacher's talents more effectively — can we make teaching more challenging and satisfying — by reducing the burden of non-professional tasks?
>
> Can we find ways to multiply the effectiveness of our most outstanding teachers in order to improve the quality of education for all students?
>
> Is it necessary for the best teacher in a school or college to be given the same functions, the same pay, and the same number of students, as the poor or average teacher?
>
> Can we devise ways to reform the job structure and salary structure so that teachers can be given functions and rewards commensurate with their varying abilities? Can we thereby create challenging avenues of advancement that will attract more of the Nation's ablest people into teaching and hold them there?
>
> Can we devise flexible architectural patterns so that bricks and mortar will not stand in the way of improving the organization of educational personnel and processes?
>
> Is our conviction that small class size is always the best guarantee of quality a valid one? Is there danger that this conviction, followed blindly, may lead toward quality erosion instead of the reverse?
>
> Have we assumed too often that young people do not really want to learn and must therefore be spoon-fed under compulsion? Have we ever tried hard enough to invite students to accept more responsibility for their own education?

The answers to these questions will not come easily. They can only come from imagination, experimentation, and evaluation in the communities and on the campuses of every state, where the ultimate responsibility and hope for American education ultimately resides. Time is short, but it has been short on other occasions when the genius and devotion of America have risen to meet great challenges. The greatest problem American education has ever faced can prove also to be its greatest opportunity. As President Gould of Antioch College pointed out recently:

> I am convinced that the tremendous and terrifying problems which suddenly face higher education in America are fortunate: they make it mandatory for us to examine what we are doing — to reassess

our educational philosophy; to adopt new methods and adapt old ones; to find new resources in teachers, facilities, and financing; and in general to raise hob with the status quo...

Changes...are necessary and important, and they will come. But they are on the plateaus of adventure...

It seems to me that this is the time for experimentation, for practical research... We have a few years of grace before the full impact of population trends, technological advances, and social changes will be upon us. After that it will be a mad scramble to keep up... In such an atmosphere of crisis we shall merely compound the errors and omissions of the past. But careful study now, properly guided and supported, will lead us to soundly conceived solutions and positive action.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN MISSISSIPPI

By R. A. McLEMORE

The administration of higher education in Mississippi has become steadily a matter of increasing concern to the public. The development of public responsibility for higher education has had a particularly rapid growth within the last half century and especially during the last decade.

There wasn't much organization and administration of higher education in the twelfth century when Abelard was the world's most renowned teacher. When higher education was established in North America the church provided such administration and organization as institutions required. The church and private boards of trustees remained the most influential factors in the administration of higher education until recently. It was not until 1950 that public institutions enrolled a larger percentage of college students than private institutions — 50.3% as compared with 49.7%. In 1955, the public institutions had 56.5% of the total and even more important 60.1% of the first time students.[1] There were a total of 1,858 institutions included in this study, 655 of them under public control and 1,203 under private auspices.[2] It seems obvious that the great increase anticipated in college enrollment will fall largely upon the public institutions.

Public higher education has developed more rapidly in Mississippi than in other areas. In 1941-42, there were 18 public and 16 private institutions of higher learning.[3] These institutions enrolled a total of 14,019 students.[4] By 1950, the total enrollment in all of the colleges of the state had increased to 21,716.[5] A significant aspect of this enrollment was that

[1] *Office of Education, Opening (Fall) Enrollment in Higher Educational Institutions 1955.* (Circular No. 460). p. 4.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

[3] President's Commission on Higher Education, *Higher Education for American Democracy*, VI, p. 13.

[4] Business Research Station (Mississippi State College), *Statistical Abstract of Mississippi 1952*, p. 42.

[5] Survey Report Board of Trustees Institutions of Higher Learning, John E. Brewton, director, *Higher Education in Mississippi 1954*, p. 278.

81.1 percent was registered in publicly controlled institutions.[6] In the fall of 1955, there were 39 Mississippi colleges represented in the statistical report. Of these, 23 were tax supported institutions and 16 privately supported.[7] The public institutions held 78.9 percent of the total enrollment. The comparable percentage for the nation was 56.5 percent.[8] The percentages of students enrolled in publicly controlled institutions are the largest for any southern state and perhaps of the nation.[9] This is one of the reasons why administration of higher education in Mississippi has been of so much concern to the public.

The increase in student enrollment in institutions of higher learning is one of the striking developments of the twentieth century. In 1900, there were 2,727 students enrolled in all of the colleges in Mississippi. In 1920, there were 4,238. The enrollment had increased to 21,716 in 1950[10] and the figure for 1955 was 25,646.[11] This is an increase of 844.5 percent in a half century. In 1950, the enrollment represented 14.6 percent of the college age population.[12] In 1955, the percentage had risen slightly to 14.9 percent.[13] The comparable figure for the nation was 30 percent. Mississippi has the lowest percentage of its college age population enrolled in institutions of higher learning of any state in the union. Mississippi does have 21,254 white college students as compared with 4,392 Negroes.[14] This would give the state a percentage of approximately 23.8 percent of whites of college age enrolled. Mississippi has a major problem in interesting a larger number of its young people in higher education.

In studying the administrative organization of higher education in Mississippi, consideration should be given to the prospective enrollment. In a very careful survey of prospective enrollment the 1954 Committee for the Study of Higher Education in Mississippi made the following projections:

1950 - Minimum - 19,575	- Maximum -	19,575
1955 - - 19,715	-	27,132
1960 - - 21,820	-	37,535
1965 - - 27,247	-	49,854
1970 - - 32,519	-	64,419
1975 - - 31,563	-	63,750

These projections show a minimum increase in enrollment of 161.24 percent and a maximum increase of 325.67 percent in the twenty-

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 279.
[7] *Circular No. 460*, p. 31.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 4.
[9] *Higher Education...1954*, p. 279.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 277.
[11] *Circular No. 460*, p. 13.
[12] *Higher Education...1954*, p. 278.
[13] U. S. Census of Population 1950, P-c24, p. 123.
[14] *Circular No. 460*, p. 31.

five year span.[15] This increase becomes more reasonable when you compare it with the 844.5 percent in the first half of the century.

The enrollment figures for 1955 are now available. This report reveals that there were 25,646 students enrolled in Mississippi colleges. This is an increase of 6.4 percent over 1954 and is near the maximum enrollment projected for the colleges in 1955 when the study group evaluated the prospects in 1953. A further very significant factor in the enrollment survey is that Mississippi showed an increase in first time students of 19.5 percent. There were only two states showing a larger increase. They were Florida with 31.2 percent and Arizona with 30.4 percent. When we remember that Mississippi's population has been relatively static these figures take on added significance.[16]

The cost of higher education is another factor that makes the problem of administration of higher education significant. In 1884-85, the appropriation for higher education was $222,054.00 or 12.7 percent of the total appropriations by the state legislature. In 1906-1907 the appropriations had risen to $521,991.28 but this represented only 8.5 percent of the total appropriations. In 1916, the appropriations were $905,041.75, which was 8.9 percent of the total appropriations.[17] The figures for subsequent decades are as follows:[18]

Year	Higher Education	Total Appropriations	Per Cent for Higher Education
1936-38	$ 1,688,654.88	$ 21,289,497.34	7.9
1946-48	5,531,827.00	111,995,249.56	4.9
1956-58	20.832.791.98	186,123,587.16	11.1

It should be pointed out that these figures do not include the appropriations for junior colleges, which are becoming more and more significant. It should also be noted that the large percentage increase in the state appropriations in 1956-58 is due in large measure to the introduction of the medical school, teaching hospital and allied disciplines into the educational program. If these services are eliminated, higher education received only 8.8 percent of the total appropriation. This is a fairer figure for comparison. It is interesting to note, whether the legislature intended it to be so or not, that the appropriations for higher education for nearly three quarters of a century have been approximately 8.5 percent of the total appropriations. It also shows that insofar as the appropriations for the 1956-58 biennium are concerned the legislature has not penalized the other institutions of higher learning for the support of the medical school.

[15] *Higher Education...1954*, p. 355.

[16] *Circular No. 460*, p. 13.

[17] State Tax Commission, *Increase in State Appropriations Over 70 Year Period.* (Issued as a public service by Mississippi Economic Council, April 13, 1953, Jackson, Mississippi).

[18] State Tax Commission, *April 6, 1956 Report on Comparison of Revenue Estimates and Recommended Appropriations as Made by Commission of Budget and Accounting for 1956-58 with Status after Adjournment of 1956 Regular Legislative Session.*

In the administration of higher education in Mississippi, another fact of great importance must be considered. Mississippi has 39 institutions to serve a population of 2,178,914. This is in the proportion of one institution to every 55,870 inhabitants. The ratio for the nation as a whole is one institution to 81,107 inhabitants.[19] It is also true that 26 of the Mississippi institutions serve the 1,188,632 whites and 13 institutions serve the 990,282 negroes. In other words, Mississippi has one institution for every 45,716 white inhabitants. This situation will restrict the size of institutions in Mississippi and increase the cost of administration. Mississippi should be very careful in establishing any additional schools.

A final consideration which underlies the policies of administration is the ability and willingness of the state to support higher education. The per capita income of Mississippi was $834.00 in 1953.[20] This was the lowest in the nation. *Higher Education in Mississippi* published in 1954 included these summary statements in regard to "the economic capacity and relative educational effort of Mississippi:

(1) The Mississippi state and local tax effort, measured as a percent of adjusted total income payments, is close to the national average, but its relative position in the southeast has tended to drop;
(2) Mississippi makes average effort to support education when income is considered, but the State has lagged behind most of the states of the Southeast in recent years; nevertheless,
(3) Mississippi's institutions of higher learning, compared with those of the 48 states and with those of the states of the Southeast, are well supported as measured by:
    (a) The percent income of institutions of higher learning from taxes and appropriations of total adjusted income payments, and,
    (b) The percent income of institutions of higher learning from taxes and appropriations of total educational income from these sources.[21]

These conclusions on the whole are complimentary. I do wish to point out, however, that the study seemed to fail to take account of the fact that Mississippi is educating a larger percent of its students in public institutions than the other states.

The development of administrative control by the state of its institutions of higher education has been on a remarkably consistent pattern. In 1910, the legislature placed all institutions under a single board. The board was reorganized in 1932 and the new institutions which had been established brought under its control. The most recent reorganization oc-

[19] Population figures from census of 1950 and number of institutions from Circular No. 460.
[20] *The World Almanac 1955*, p. 757.
[21] *Higher Education...1954*, p. 362.

curred in 1942 when the Board of Trustees of Institutions of Higher Learning was made a constitutional board with its twelve members appointed by the governor, with the consent of the senate, for twelve year overlapping terms. This board has the power to provide a uniform, coordinated program of higher education, and is responsible for "all matters incident to the proper functioning of the institutions." The trustees also have the power "to make any adjustments they think necessary between the different institutions."[22] The board was given permission to employ a full time executive secretary and establish a central office to perform certain essential services.

The Mississippi type of coordination machinery is recognized as one of the most satisfactory in the nation. There are nineteen states which have adopted some type of coordinating machinery. The Mississippi program is distinguished by its ability to coordinate the institutions through uniform general practices and at the same time maintain and strengthen the prestige and individuality of the various institutions. The board has been concerned with the overall quality and quantity of state supported higher education, the framing of major policies, and planning for the future. In discharging this responsibility the board has attempted to avoid infringement upon the aims of the different institutions. It is the freedom which the board has allowed each institution which has contributed to the development of higher education in the state.

There has been a realization for some time that the board needed more professional and technical advice than it had available. The 1945 *Study of Higher Education* (p. 28) recommended the appointment of additional professional technical specialists to the office staff of the executive secretary. In 1954, the study staff made similar recommendations (p. 27). The legislature in 1956 recognized this need and empowered the board to employ "such technical, professional and clerical assistance as the board may deem necessary." (Senate Bill 1608)

Governor Coleman has recognized that not only geographical areas but also different professional, industrial, and economic aspects of life should be represented on the board. It seems that this recognition is especially desirable in a day when college training is as important in every aspect of life as it once was in law, medicine, theology and teaching.

I believe that Mississippi has one of the best programs for the administration of higher education of any state in the union. I am also convinced that the state is getting the maximum return on every dollar invested in higher education. There are significant problems to be met but I see no reason why they cannot be handled as satisfactorily within our present state administrative framework as they could within any other program.

[22]Board of Trustees, Institutions of Higher Learning, Joseph E. Gibson, director, *Mississippi Study of Higher Education 1945*, p. 32.

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION IN MISSISSIPPI

By A. A. MYERS

Water is more than a natural resource — it is a necessity of life.

There is now widespread interest in water resources of Mississippi and in water rights legislature.

In recent years, with an expanding and changing economy, our need for and use of water as a resource has grown, broadened and become more complex. This has called for an entirely new appraisal of our water situation, including both water laws and programs.

The Mississippi Water Resources Policy Commission with the help of a number of people and agencies, have accomplished a yeoman task in conducting detailed studies of our water problems, and in recommending appropriate action to the State Legislature. This group of men have also done a splendid work in focusing attention on and developing interest in water problems of the State.

It is recognized by many that before the situation becomes critical, we must intensify and broaden our efforts toward a more orderly program of water development, conservation, and wise use of this essential raw material. In a few short years, water has become a key factor and commodity, in the growth of our agriculture, industries, towns, cities and recreation facilities.

My assigned subject is "Soil and Water Conservation." I like that, too, because I believe water resources begin where the rain first hits the land. Water in streams, in wells and in storage reservoirs or ponds is merely an accumulation of rain that once fell on the land.

Our water supplies are renewed through a revolving or recurring process, often referred to as the hydrologic cycle.

Water is evaporated from the surface of the sea, brought overland where it may be precipitated as rain or snow. Thence, it runs off into streams or ponds or percolates into underground formations. Some portion is taken into the systems of plants and animals. And the cycle is then complete with a return to the atmosphere by evaporation or transpiration. Or, water may return to the sea through streams, underground seeps or as precipitation.

In discussing soil and water conservation, my remarks will be

centered around the movement of water as it strikes the land, infiltrates into the soil and moves over the face of the earth.

Water is a moving resource which can do harm or do good depending on how it is used and managed. It is also a resource from which maximum benefits can be obtained over the year, if it is used wisely and not wastefully.

Surface water flowing uncontrolled across cropland causes sheet erosion which has resulted in the loss of millions of tons of rich top soil. Sheet erosion and soil depletion here greatly lowered fertility and the infiltration ability of the soil.

Thousands of acres have been ruined by gully erosion in Mississippi. Water that falls on land like this does not soak into the soil but runs off and is lost.

Severe erosion pyramids the water problem for not only is there a loss of land but vast loads of silt and sand are carried on to fertile bottomland and into our streams.

Silt is really top soil — a previous asset in its proper place.

Silt borne in water adds impurities to surface water and deteriorates its quality for municipal and industrial use. The prevention of silt in streams is a problem of land use and land management.

Mississippi's biggest surface water problem, certainly the most spectacular, centers around disastrous floods.

The average annual flood loss in the Pearl, Tombigbee and Pascagoula River Basins is estimated to be in excess of 3 million dollars. The annual flood losses in the Delta prior to the installation of flood control improvements in the Yazoo River Basin, is estimated to exceed 5 million dollars. However, substantial reduction in annual flood damage has resulted from the flood control program already completed.

Water has many beneficial uses. Water is an essential factor in a cattle production program. Because of this interest, farm ponds have grown tremendously over the past 10 years. Thousands of ponds are furnishing water for our growing cattle industry — both dairy and beef.

Ponds are used as water storage to save excess runoff for use during dry weather periods.

There has been a great interest in supplemental irrigation during the past few years, especially during the dry years of 1953 and 1854. An important factor in agricultural expansion is increased use of water for irrigation.

Farm ponds in addition to supplying water for livestock and irrigation, also furnish recreation facilities to farm families and on occasions to some city friends. A well fertilized and managed pond can produce 300# of fish per acre-foot of water.

One of the problems in the conservation, use and management of our water resources is the rainfall pattern we receive in Mississippi.

Although Mississippi, on an annual basis, has a considerable water supply — 50 inches per year, which is greater than most areas in our country, our agricultural water supply is seasonal. We have ample rainfall during the winter and early spring months when the water needs of

plants are low. During the summer growing season, when it is needed for maximum yields of quality crops, we have too little. Also, during this same season — the hot dry summer months — other uses of water are also at a maximum such as industries, towns, cities and recreation.

One of the basic problems in this connection, then, is to store as much rain as possible so that it will be available for use during dry seasons. Excess water may be stored above ground in reservoirs and ponds, or it may be stored through natural and artificial means in the ground, where it may be available when needed as well water, spring water or stream flow. Water which runs off instead of soaking in is lost and frequently cannot be recaptured. Relatively speaking, only small amounts can be stored behind dams or pumped back artificially as recharge water. *The greatest storage reservoir is the ground itself.* This soil body represents a vast reservoir with tremendous storage capacity.

For that reason, as I pointed out previously, water conservation *must begin* where the rain hits the earth. It must begin, then, on the lands of the State — in the upper reaches of all watersheds from the ridge to the creek. It really begins in the cultivated field, in the pasture, in the wood lots, along country roads, and on every acre of land in the State — where rain first hits the earth.

Water conservation starts with the right land use for each kind of land and the application of needed conservation practices to prevent erosion and to get more water to go into the soil and pass through it slowly.

Research and experience has proven that sound land use and soil and water conservation practices play a major part in holding water where it falls.

Vegetation plays an important part in holding water on the land and in maintaining porous, spongy soil structure, both of which are essential to maximum in-soak or infiltration.

Planting of pine seedling on lands unsuited to the production of crops or pasture protects the land and puts it to good use. With the nation's timber supply rapidly shrinking, this is sound land use and sound economy as well.

Properly managed and protected from fire, a forest will absorb and hold more rainfall than any other type of land cover. Forest fires destroy the "sponge layer" being built up on top of the soil by the trees and greatly decreases the ability of the soil to store water.

The growing of pastures on land unsuited for crops is also sound land use in that grasses and legumes protect the land and increases the infiltration rate of the soil. Improved pastures stabilize the land and store fertility for future use.

Perennial grasses and legumes produce a tremendous root system that grows deep in the soil. Such a growth helps to prevent excessive runoff of water and increases the water in-soak rate of the soil.

The growing of grass and legumes in rotation with row crops — cotton and corn — on the better lands is a modern conservation measure in Mississippi. This method makes use of crop residue in and on the soil to encourage infiltration, and to maintain or build up soil fertility.

Vegetation waterways in a terrace system slows down runoff and prevents erosion.

Terraces and contour cultivation when used with vegetation practices such as cover crops and crop rotation will slow water down and allow it to percolate into the soil.

The proper use of water for agricultural purposes is an important item in a water resources program. During recent years there has been an increase in the use of water for irrigation of rice and other crops.

Today there are tremendous possibilities for supplemental irrigation. These opportunities are for more efficient production of crops through proper use of water.

Proper use of water in farm ponds have implemented our livestock industry in the State. In addition, they are used as water storage for irrigation.

There are many other sound conservation practices that will facilitate high infiltration rates in soil. Use of winter cover crops, contour plowing and strip cropping are examples of such other practices.

A going "soil and water conservation program" on every farm in the State offers one of the best means of "holding water where it falls" and channeling it into underground storage. It is very important that such a program be accelerated in natural recharge areas of our ground water supplies.

THE IPPY FAMILY AND THEIR EIGHT CHILDREN

A MISSISSIPPI PARABLE

By R. C. WEEMS, JR.

Once upon a time there lived a beautiful young lady in a large antebellum home overlooking the mighty Father of Waters. Her mother was of French and Spanish descent. Her father, who was of British ancestry, owned many slaves and cultivated thousands of acres of fine cotton fields. The young lady had everything she desired.

One day she met and immediately fell in love with a young man from the hill country. Her father and mother were not particularly impressed with his last name which was "Ippy." But he was a hard worker, very conscientious, ambitious, and sincere, and they consented to have him as a son-in-law. A short while after their marriage, Mr. and Mrs. Ippy moved to the northern part of the state, where they settled upon lands recently vacated by the Indians. Their married life was very happy and soon their home was blessed by the arrival of a son. Papa Ippy wished to name him Oxford, in the British tradition, but the influence of the mother prevailed and he was christened Lafayette — also in honor of the county in which he was born. Little Lafayette was not strong at birth and his early growth was none too rapid, but he was the first and only child and naturally received the greatest admiration and attention. Also there was a determination on the part of his parents to give him every opportunity and support and they hoped that he would some day become a great and famous man. This attitude spoiled little Lafayette somewhat and in a very short time he came to realize that he could get away with almost anything. He so loved being the center of attention, that he resolved not to disappoint the hopes of his parents, although somehow down deep inside he felt that his proud mother and father were expecting things from him which he could never deliver.

From sometime after the birth of Lafayette things went very well for Mr. and Mrs. Ippy. They had moved into the east central section of the state in the hope of finding richer farm lands, and they were happier than ever before when there was born to them another little son, whom they called Stark. Stark was a vigorous youngster who loved to play in

the sand and especially make mud pies. He was very proficient in finding the richest and blackest mud. Like most children, he was an individual in his own right and his parents had to broaden their thinking considerably in order to bridge the great gap in personality which lay between Stark and Lafayette. In fact, they were strongly attracted to Stark and his practical ways and they were particularly proud when Stark began to show an interest in mechanical toys as well as mud pies. Although they knew that Stark would never grow into the same type of cultured man as would the more effeminate Lafayette, they knew also that he was destined to make a good honest living and could be depended upon in a very practicable way. Although Mr. and Mrs. Ippy seemed to favor young Stark, they tried to give equal affection to both their sons.

The Ippys carefully avoided a show of favor for any child, that is, until little Columbine arrived. She was the cutest little girl that ever graced a home. So infatuated were they with the little daughter and so greatly did they admire young Stark's practical ways, that they at first decided that Columbine should have a vocational type of education rather than to be allowed to develop along the more cultured lines that Lafayette was following. But the parents became a little ashamed of themselves when little Columbine began to show more and more that she intended to become a young lady of culture and refinement rather than a shop girl or factory worker. Mr. and Mrs. Ippy wisely allowed her to follow along the lines which she preferred.

This fine family now had three fine children, two boys and a girl — each child different and each child beloved by its parents. Family expenses were very heavy, but father Ippy felt that it was worth all of the hard work that it was taking on his part and he was happy to be head of such a family.

Meanwhile, another burden had begun to weigh heavily upon the Ippys. A colored family which worked on Mr. Ippy's place had given birth to a son, who was called Alcorn. This colored family was not financially able to assume the entire support of little Alcorn; so they had appealed to Mr. Ippy. He thought so much of the colored family that he agreed to contribute regularly to Alcorn's support and to assist in guiding the child along the road of life. Mr. Ippy felt that Alcorn should be brought up in the practical arts of Stark rather than in the cultural posturings of Lafayette and Columbine. In this, of course, Mr. Ippy acted without the knowledge of the innermost feelings of little Alcorn; for when the child began to display his talents, he appeared to resemble Lafayette and Columbine far more than he did Stark. So little Alcorn too began to put on cultural airs. However, Mr. Ippy never gave up on this point and he continued to encourage Alcorn toward a vocational type of education. This, Alcorn steadfastly and determinedly refused to accept, except in a half-hearted way.

Father Ippy now had truly great responsibilities, even for a family man. He had not regretted any part of it up to this time, but now both he and Mrs. Ippy were really beginning to worry, for they were not financially able to handle all their bundles of love.

As might be expected though, since Mr. and Mrs. Ippy were still quite young, another baby was born to them. By now the Ippys had moved to the southern part of the state amid towering pine forests, and the baby boy was appropriately named Longleaf. Mrs. Ippy said that she would have named a girl baby Hattie. Long before Longleaf's birth his mother had decided on a teaching career for him. Teaching they regarded as a great calling. They knew of the needs and opportunities for good teachers, so they resolved to devote themselves wholeheartedly toward making him into a pedagogue. Longleaf was fairly well satisfied even when he eventually learned that his career had been pre-selected; for he realized, as his parents had taught him so many times, that great teachers are born and not made.

This latest arrival presented a still greater burden on the family, but parents' obligations are always toward their children; so the Ippys were determined to do the best they could by Longleaf and all the other Ippys. They hoped and prayed, however, that Longleaf would be satisfied to be a teacher.

In fact, in spite of their growing number of children, they were so happy in their hope for Longleaf and his teaching career that when they moved to the Delta and another new arrival, Cleve, came along, they decided that he, too, should become a teacher and that no other profession would do for either Longleaf or Cleve. By then, however, the family burden was great, indeed. In fact, papa could hardly pay the bills.

It was the shock of a lifetime for papa when the same colored family to whom Alcorn was born, turned up with two other children, Jackson and Itta Bena. Papa Ippy instinctively knew that he would be expected to contribute to their support and to advise them in the same manner that he had done with Alcorn.

So great were the Ippys' burdens and responsibilities now that it was finally decided to consult a family counselor, Mr. Peabody by name. They explained their problem in detail and told of the growing difficulties they were having. They said they had had more dependents than they had expected but that they loved them all and wanted to do the best for each of them. The fact remained, however, that the children could not be given all that they called for and needed in life.

The counselor reminded them that planned families are always better off in this respect, but that it was now, of course, too late to do anything about that. Mrs. Ippy thought that perhaps the counselor might indicate how they could terminate their family growth at this point and was disappointed when the counselor gave her no advice in this respect. But he did make a worthwhile suggestion or two as to how they might best bring up the large family they already had. He told them to make Stark quit trying to be like Lafayette, especially since Stark was getting so big that Lafayette was becoming rather sensitive about it. He also suggested that the other children could be kept from irritating one another if all received a little more parental guidance and correction. Mr. and Mrs. Ippy went away feeling that they had gotten only a small amount of usable advice — in fact, very little which they had not known already.

A short time after they were back home, Mrs. Ippy dearly wished that the counselor had given her a few instructions on birth control, for she was pregnant again and she had a premonition that this child would want the most expensive education of all — that of a doctor; and she knew that the family could not at all afford it. She discussed it with Mr. Ippy; and although he was somewhat shocked, they both became resigned to their fate and decided their youngest child would receive a medical education. Mr. Ippy had no idea how he would pay for it.

By this time, Mr. and Mrs. Ippy returned to the family counselor and they were indeed in earnest. They desperately needed some good advice and they were determined to get it. Mrs. Ippy was particularly interested in how she might prevent another pregnancy. But the counselor again seemed to overlook this most important point. In fact, he went so far as to assure them that large families can be a blessing rather than a disgrace. Mr. Peabody went even farther. He reminded the Ippys of their country kin — a truly phenomenal family of seventeen children, who, however, had been able to receive only a junior college education. This did not impress the Ippys particularly, for they did not want to curtail the higher education of either their sons or daughters, at least not just for the sake of a still larger family.

The counselor said that he knew of several ways in which the family might make better use of their financial resources and achieve the most for each child. Lafayette, said the counselor, should be called upon to assist in bringing up little Cleve, who had always been a good child. Of course, Cleve was not consulted in this matter; but the counselor thought that after a few tantrums and a sound spanking, Cleve would acquiesce. One thing the counselor seemed to have overlooked was the fact that little Cleve's Delta uncles had become particularly attached to the child and they did not at all intend for him to be put under the influence and guidance of anyone else, much less the effeminate Lafayette.

Then the counselor suggested that Stark assume the responsibility for Columbine. This relationship was suggested, of course, without the consent of Columbine. Also a point which the counselor overlooked was the fact that although Columbine had great respect for her strong healthy brother who was interested in agriculture and mechanics, and was actually showing some interest in business and social studies, she did not feel that he would ever be able to understand her own choice, which lay in the field of art and dramatics. She resented very much the fact that she could not be allowed to make up her own mind but would have to find guidance from someone who might prove to be completely lacking in understanding; and besides, Columbine loved to shine in her own lovely light.

Then the counselor went on to point out that he was delighted with the way young Longleaf had developed — that he had now not only become a teacher but a musician, a businessman, and below-the-border internationalist as well. He suggested that Longleaf was showing signs of true genius and should be allowed to develop any way he darn pleased.

Then Mr. Peabody went on to say that what he had recommended for the Ippy children might also be done with respect to its colored wards.

Lafayette should be asked to take over the guidance of Jackson and Itta Bena and Stark should take over the responsibility of young Alcorn. Race relations having become quite an important issue in the state, Mr. and Mrs. Ippy were getting particularly concerned about the proposed status of their family. Also the Ippys were beginning to worry a bit about the ability of the family counselor they had selected. In fact, Mrs. Ippy told Mr. Ippy that she sometimes wondered whether or not Mr. Peabody had ever raised any children of his own. She is now informing each of her children of the facts of life as soon as they comprehend in the hope that they will be able to solve their own future problems without having to consult professional counselors.

TWO LETTERS FROM POBEDONOSTSEV, 1902 - 1903

By JOSEPH O. BAYLEN

When the exponent of the "New Journalism," W. T. Stead (1849-1912), first interviewed Konstantin Petrovich Pobedonostsev (1827-1907), the powerful confidant of the Emperors[1] and Procurator of the Holy Synod was at the height of his power. Yet, the English editor, already well-known for his sympathy and friendship for the Russian people and their Imperial masters,[2] was somewhat shocked by the views of the dour master of thought control in Russia.[3] In spite of his devotion to the Slavophil propagandist, Madame Olga Novikov,[4] Stead's Nonconformist background precluded any warm feeling for a man who had "substituted fear for faith as the principle of action." Although he was willing to admit that Pobedonostsev was basically "A good narrow man, quite convinced that he is doing his duty, and capable of impressing that conviction on the minds of others," Stead deplored the Procurator's negative influence over the Emperor as "one of the darkest shadows of the... reign."[5] He correctly discerned that most of the Imperial ministers owed their positions to Pobedonostsev's power, but the enormity of this power became even more apparent to Stead when the *censor extraordinaire* banned his *Truth about Russia* as unfit to be read by Russians because it

[1]Alexander III (1881-1894) and Nicholas II (1894-1918).

[2]On Stead's opinions and evaluation of Pobedonostsev and warm feelings for Russia, see W. T. Stead, *The Truth about Russia* (London, 1888), pp. 318-26, 332-39, 345-53ff, hereafter cited as *Truth about Russia;* R. W. Robertson Scott, *The Life and Death of a Newspaper* (London, 1952), pp. 74, 147; Frederic Whyte, *Life of W. T. Stead* (London, 1925), 2 vols., *passim.*

[3]Cf. Arthur E. Adams, "Pobedonostsev's Thought Control," *The Russian Review,* XI (October, 1952), 241-46.

[4]Madame Novikov had arranged Stead's interview with her friend and mentor, Pobedonostsev. Cf. W. T. Stead, ed. *The M. P. for Russia. Reminiscences and Correspondence of Madame Olga Novikoff* (London, 1909), II, 242, hereafter cited as *Correspondence of Mme. Novikoff.* On the career of Madame Novikov and her relationship to Stead, see Joseph O. Baylen, "Madame Olga Novikov, Propagandist," *The American Slavic and East European Review,* X (December, 1951), 255-71.

[5]Stead, *Truth about Russia,* pp. 321, 323-24.

contained the above-mentioned views.[6] What made this even more unpleasant to Stead was the fact that such acts were justified by the Procurator's absolute conviction that he had been summoned by God to save Russia from the evil and decadence of the West.[7]

Pobedonostsev's desire to remain the anonymous *éminence grise* behind the throne and his extreme sensitivity to criticism in the foreign press are reflected in the enclosed letters to Stead.[8] Thus it was not so much the news item in Stead's *Review of Reviews* attributing to the Procurator the removal of General Petr Vannovsky as Minister of Education, but the conclusion that "this may be the darkest hour before the dawn"[9] which perturbed him most. And well might he be concerned! This statement augured the end of an era (1881-1905) in which Pobedonostsev had exercised his greatest influence in the Russian government and labored tirelessly to make "firmness at the centre" the predominant principle of the Imperial regime.[10]

It was Pobedonostsev's policy of "firmness," as expressed by the "unwarranted" curtailment of Finland's autonomy within the Russian Empire by the Governor General, Nikolai Bobrikov,[11] in 1898 and 1903, that aroused the ire of Stead. His deep sympathy for the Finns in their struggle against Bobrikov's tyranny and friendship for the Emperor impelled Stead to boldly warn Nicholas II in 1899 that Russia's role as "the despoiler of the liberty of Finland" prejudiced the Tsar's position as "the Peace Conference Maker" at the First Hague Conference.[12] These misgivings concerning the oppression of the Finns were repeated by Stead in the article which attributed the fall of Vannovsky to Pobedonostsev and undoubtedly served as a double irritant to the latter-day Torquemada.[13] When Bobrikov's arbitrary use of martial law against the Finns in 1903 constrained Stead to address an open letter of protest to the Minister of Interior, V. K. von Plehve,[14] he pointedly requested Pobedonostsev to transmit the communication to his *protogé*.. The massive was considered of sufficient import to elicit from Plehve a strong defence of the Imperial

[6] *Correspondence of Mms. Novikoff*, II, 251.

[7] Stead, *Truth about Russia*, p. 323.

[8] I am deeply indebted to Miss Estelle W. Stead and Mr. W. E. Stead for permission to study and use the Stead papers. Pobedonostsev's letters to Stead certainly reflect the latter's judgment that the Procurator's knowledge of English was more "literary than colloquial." Cf. Stead, *Truth about Russia*, p. 324.

[9] Cf. "Trouble in Russia," *The Review of Reviews*, XXV (May, 1902), 450.

[10] A. E. Adams, "Pobedonostsev and the Rule of Firmness," *The Slavonic and East European Review*, XXXII (December, 1953), 132.

[11] Nikolai Bobrikov (1839-1904) served as Governor General of the Grand Duchy of Finland from 1898 until his assassination in 1904.

[12] W. T. Stead to Nicholas II, 25 June, 1899, The Hague, cited in Whyte, II, 160.

[13] Cf. *The Review of Reviews*, XXV (May, 1902), 450.

[14] See fn. 25.

government's policy which was given the widest publicity by the enterprising Stead.[15]

Even more important was Pobedonostsev's objection to Stead's friendly review of Prince Petr Kropotkin's recent article on Russia's gradual transition from autocracy to constitutional monarchy.[16] The Procurator's pique was, in a sense, the culmination of a literary duel with the anarchist prince that had its inception in a paper in which Kropotkin had severely censured the Minister of Education, Nikolai Bogolepov, [17] for his brutal treatment of dissenting university students and denounced Pobedonostsev as "a narrow-minded fanatic ... who — if it were only in his power — would have burned at stake all protestants against Orthodoxy..."[18] In a spirited reply to the "professional apostle of anarchy and socialism," Pobedonostsev sought to correct for the benefit of foreigners the "errors" and "ignorance" of a "renegade" Russian "whose impressions of the present state of Russia [were] based only on gossip..." As usual, he denied any connection with the acts of the government and absolved the Crown of any responsibility for Bogolepov's decrees by explaining that the Tsar merely confirmed the decisions of his Cabinet "in cases prescribed by the law." Yet, he scorned Kropotkin's attempt to see in Russia the development of "outworn" constitutional forms from the West and challenged his assumption that "the password 'liberty' is... a talisman capable of ... solving all questions of human existence." Kropotkin's article, he concluded, not only "furnishes another striking example of the monstrous lies spread by the [foreign] press concerning the internal condition of Russia," but illustrates the anarchist's fallacy in clinging to the "worn out [creeds of] pedants in the first half of the nineteenth century."[19]

Kropotkin returned to the lists with a trenchant article which emphasized that in spite of Pobedonostsev's arguments to the contrary, he had actually developed in his paper "the theory of the constitutional monarchy in Russia" and thus confirmed the drift of the Imperial regime toward constitutionalism. With irony Kropotkin pointed out what had rendered this tendency "unavoidable" were "The colossal blunders of the ministers, and their increasingly frequent assumption of the right, under

[15]Cf. V. Plehve to W. T. Stead, 19 August/1 September, 1903, St. Petersburg, in "A Defence of Russia's Policy in Finland by His Excellency M. de Plehve, Russian Minister of the Interior," *The Review of Reviews*, XXVIII (October, 1903), 354-356. See also "Mr. Plehve's Admission: A Comment by W. T. Stead," *Ibid.*, pp. 357-58.

[16]Cf. "Leading Articles in the Reviews: Constitutional Monarchy in Russia," *The Review of Reviews*, XXV (May, 1902), 495.

[17]Nikolai Bogolepov (1847-1901), Minister of Education (1898-1901).

[18]Prince P. Kropotkin, "The Present Crisis in Russia," *The North American Review*, CLXXII (May, 1901), 716.

[19]Constantin Pobiedonostseff, "Russia and Popular Education. A Reply to Prince Kropotkin," *The North American Review*, CLXXIII (September, 1901), 347-54ff.

the shelter of the Emperor's signature, of modifying by mere decrees the fundamental laws of the Empire..."[20]

Pobedonostsev now contented himself with weakly requesting Stead to judge Kropotkin's devastating reply by the examination of an earlier exposition of Slavophil *Weltanschauung* as a dialectical defence of the autocratic system in Russia. The old reactionary's last parry was, in a sense, the symbolic gasp of a regime on the threshold of death.

Weisbaden 5/ 18 May 1902

Personally and Private

Dear Mr. Stead

There is no end of lies about my poor person in the daily press. Please, do not repeat these lies without verification. In your last [issue of *The Review of Reviews*] p. 450 I read: 'General Vannovsky's[21] resignation is attributed to the ascendancy of M. P [obedonostsev] in the councils of Emperor.'[22] All that is *lie* , and my ascendancy is nothing as fable invented by tatlers inconscious [sic] of truth. When something concerning me *personally* can be interesting for the opinion [sic], please, ask me privately and you shall know the *truth*.

On p. 495 there is an article 'on the Constitutional Monarchy in Russia'![23] The author of this article could read with profit N. 226 'Publications of the American Academy of Political and Social Science' — There is a paper on the Social Theories and Russian Conditions, by Dr. Sigel. (London. King and Son ... Bridge St. Westminster).[24]

Yours Sincerely

s/C. Pobedonosteff

[20]Prince Kropotkin, "Russian Schools and the Holy Synod," *The North American Review*, CLXXIV (April, 1902), 526-27.

[21]General Petr Semenovich Vannovsky (1822-1904) replaced the notorious Bogolepov as Minister of Education after the murder of the latter in February, 1901. Vannovsky served in this post from February, 1901 until he incurred the displeasure of Pobedonostsev and was forced to resign in April, 1902.

[22]A garbled version of "General Vannovsky's resignation is attributed to the ascendancy of M. Pobyedonostseff in the counsels of the Emperor." Cf. *The Review of Reviews*, XXV (May, 1902), 450. See fn. 9.

[23]Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 495. See fn. 16.

[24]F. Sigel, "Sociology Applied to Politics. Social Theories and Russian Conditions," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, XI (March, 1898), 137-73ff. Pobedonostsev apparently refers to the London distributor of the journal.

Dear Mr. Stead

I have transmitted your letter to Mr Pleve;[25] [sic] but you could as well send this letter direct to Mr. Pleve.[26] As for me, I have and had nothing to do and to decide in the political measures of government concerning Finland and *other* matters.[27]

Yours truly

s/C. Pobedonosteff

Csars. Selo[28]
July 30 1903
Aug 12

[25]See W.T. Stead to V.Plehve, 31 July, 1903, London, in W.T. Stead, "Russia's Policy in Finland. An Open Letter to M. de Plehve," *The Review of Reviews*, XXVIII (August, 1903), 142-45.

[26]Vyacheslav K. von Plehve (1846-1904), a militant and ruthless reactionary, succeeded N. S. Sipyagin as Minister of Interior and served in that post until liquidated by terrorists in July, 1904.

[27]For evidence to the contrary and particularly on Pobedonostsev's control of administrative offices and policies during the reigns of Alexander III and Nicholas II, see Elias Hurwicz, *Konstantin Petrowitsch Pobjedonoszew der Staatsman und der Reaktion unter Alexander III* (Konigsbert, 1933), *passim;* K. P. Pobedonostsev, *Pisma Pobedonostseva k Aleksandru III s prilozheniem pism k Velikomu Knyazu Sergeiu Aleksandrovichu i Nikolau II* (Moskva, 1925-26), Vol. II, *passim.*

[28]Tsarskoe Selo, the summer palace of the Imperial family.